arXiv:0902.4348v1 [cs.LO] 25 Feb 2009

On ground word problem of term equation systems

Sándor Vágvölgyi
Department of Foundations of Computer Science
University of Szeged
H-6720 Szeged, Árpád tér 2, Hungary
Email: vagvolgy@inf.u-szeged.hu

Abstract

We give elementary semi-decision procedures for the ground word problem of variable preserving term equation systems and term equation systems.

Keywords: variable preserving term equation systems, term equation systems, ground word problem, ground term rewriting systems, tree automata

1 Introduction

Knuth-Bendix procedure provides a semi-decision procedure for the word problem of a term equation system. Among a vast literature on its variations, see, for example, [1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13].

A term equation $l \approx r$ is called variable preserving if the same variables occur in the left-hand side l as in the right-hand side r. A term equation system (TES) S is called variable preserving if all of its equations are variable preserving. Example 4.1.4 on page 60 in [1] shows a variable preserving TES with undecidable ground word problem.

First we give an elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs. Second we generalize our semidecision procedure to TESs. We give an elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of TESs. We apply the results of Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4, 5, 12] on ground TESs (GTESs) and tree automata.

In Section 2, we present three trivial semi-decision procedures for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs and TESs. In Section 3, we intuitively describe our elementary semi-decision procedures for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs and TESs. In Section 4, we present a brief review of the notions, notations, and preliminary results used in the paper. In section 5, we recall some results of Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4, 5, 12] on the connections between GTESs and tree automata. In Section 6, we present our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of a variable preserving TES. In Section 7, we present our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of a TES.

2 Three Trivial Procedures

In this section we present three trivial semi-decision procedures. The first one is for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs. The second and the third ones are for the ground word problem of TESs. The third one is a direct improvement of the first one.

Our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs is a straightforward improvement of the first trivial procedure. Our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of TESs is a natural improvement of the second and third trivial procedures.

2.1 First trivial semi-decision procedure

```
Input: A variable preserving TES $S$, ground terms $p$, $q$.
Output: ’yes’ if $p \leftrightarrow_S^* q$, ’no’ or undefined otherwise.
Let $U_0 = \{ p \}$, $V_0 = \{ q \}$, $i = 0$.
repeat
    $i := i + 1$;
    $U_i := U_{i-1} \cup \{ s |$ there is $u \in U_{i-1}$ such that $u \leftrightarrow_R s \}$;
    $V_i := V_{i-1} \cup \{ s |$ there is $u \in V_{i-1}$ such that $u \leftrightarrow_R s \}$;
    if ($U_i = U_{i-1}$ or $V_i = V_{i-1}$) and $U_i \cap V_i$ is empty
    then begin output ’no’; halt end
until $U_i \cap V_i$ is not empty;
    output ’yes’;
    halt
```

For any variable preserving TES S and ground term u, the set $\{ s | u \leftrightarrow_R s \}$ is finite and then effectively computable. Thus, U_i and V_i, $i \geq 0$ are finite and can be computed effectively. Hence the above procedure can be implemented. Observe that U_i, $i \geq 0$ does not depend on q.

Assume that

- we have run our procedure for the TES S and ground terms p, q, that
- during the run of the proceedure we found that $U_{i+1} = U_i$ for some $i \geq 0$.

Then $U_i = U_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Furthermore, suppose that for an arbitrary $q' \in T_\Sigma$, we want to decide whether $p \leftrightarrow_R^* q'$. Then $p \leftrightarrow_R^* q'$ if and only if $q' \in U_i$. Thus we need not run the above procedure for the TES S and ground terms p, q'. We simply check whether $q' \in U_i$.

2.2 Second trivial semi-decision procedure

Let S be a TES. We now define the GTESs W_i for $i \geq 1$. GTES W_1 consists of all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, obtained by substituting ground trees of height 0 for all variables appearing in l or r. For each $i \geq 2$, GTES W_i consists of

- all elements of W_{i-1} and
- all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S obtained by substituting ground trees of height $i - 1$ for all variables appearing in l or r such that $(l', r') \notin \leftrightarrow_{W_{i-1}}^*$.

Our trivial semi-decision procedure is as follows.

```
Input: A TES $S$, ground terms $p$, $q$.
Output: ’yes’ if $p \leftrightarrow_S^* q$, ’no’ or undefined otherwise.
$i := 0$;
repeat $i := i + 1$;
    compute $W_i$;
    if $p \leftrightarrow_{W_i}^* q$ then
    begin output ’yes’; halt end
until $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$;
    output ’no’;
    halt
```

Observe that W_i, $i \geq 0$ can be computed effectively. Furthermore, W_i, $i \geq 0$ does not depend on p and q. If we could decide for each $i \geq 1$, whether $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, whether $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and whether $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, then the above procedure could be implemented. For each $i \geq 1$, let h_{P_i}, h_{Q_i}, and h_{W_i} be the maximum of the heights of the trees appearing in $S \cup P_i$, $S \cup Q_i$, and $S \cup W_i$, respectively. We conjecture that

- $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{P_i}$ if and only if $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$,
- $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{Q_i}$ if and only if $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and
- $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{W_i}$ if and only if $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$.

Assume that our conjecture is right. Then for an arbitrary TES S and integer $i \geq 0$, it is decidable whether $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, whether $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and whether $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence the above procedure could be implemented.

2.3 Third trivial semi-decision procedure

Input: A TES S, ground terms p, q.
Output: ’yes’ if $p \leftrightarrow_S^* q$, ’no’ or undefined otherwise.

```
    Let $U_0 = \{ p \}$, $V_0 = \{ q \}$, $i = 0$.
repeat
    $i := i + 1$
    $U_i := U_{i-1} \cup \{ s|$ there is $u \in U_{i-1}$ such that $u \leftrightarrow_S s$, where we substitute ground trees of
     height less than or equal to $i - 1$ for all variables that do not appear on that side of the
     applied equation which is matched with a subtree of $u \}$;
    $V_i := V_{i-1} \cup \{ s|$ there is $u \in V_{i-1}$ such that $u \leftrightarrow_S s$, where we substitute ground trees of
     height less than or equal to $i - 1$ for all variables that do not appear on that side of the
    applied equation which is matched with a subtree of $u \}$,
    if ($U_i = U_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ or $V_i = V_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$) and $U_i \cap V_i$ is empty
    then begin output ’no’; halt end
until $U_i \cap V_i$ is not empty
    output ’yes’;
        halt
```

For every TES S, ground term u, and integer $j \geq 0$, consider the set Z of all ground terms $s \in T_\Sigma$ such that $u \leftrightarrow_S s$, where we substitute ground trees of height less than or equal to j for all variables that do not appear on that side of the applied equation which is matched with a subtree of u. Set Z is finite and then effectively computable. Thus, U_i and V_i, $i \geq 0$ are finite and can be computed effectively. If we could decide for each $i \geq 1$, whether ($U_{i+k} = U_i$ for $k \geq 1$ or $V_{i+k} = V_i$ for $k \geq 1$) then the above procedure could be implemented.

For each $i \geq 1$, let h_{U_i}, h_{V_i} be the maximum of the heights of the trees appearing in (S and U_i), in (S and V_i), respectively. We conjecture that

- $U_i = U_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{U_i}$ if and only if $U_i = U_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$,

- $V_i = V_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{V_i}$ if and only if $V_i = V_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$.

Assume that our conjecture is right. Then for an arbitrary TES S and integer $i \geq 0$, it is decidable whether $U_i = U_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and whether $V_i = V_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence the above procedure can be implemented.

Assume that

- we have run our procedure for the TES S and ground terms p, q, that
- during the run of the proceedure we found that $U_{i+k} = U_i$, $k \geq 1$, for some $i \geq 0$, and that
- we want to decide whether $p \leftrightarrow_S^* q'$ for some $q' \in T_\Sigma$.

Then we need not run the above procedure for the TES S and ground terms p, q'. We simply check whether $q' \in U_i$. Because $p \leftrightarrow_S^* q'$ if and only if $q' \in U_i$.

3 Intuitive Descripition of the Semi-Decision Procedures

First we intuitively describe our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs. Second we intuitively describe our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of TESs. We base our procedures on the trivial semi-decision procedures presented in Section 2. We apply the results of Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4, 5, 12] on GTESs and tree automata.

We now intuitively describe our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs. Let S be an arbitrary TES. We define the GTESs P_i, Q_i, W_i for $i \geq 1$.

- GTES P_1 consists of all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where the left-hand side l' is a subtree of p or the right-hand side r' is a subtree of p.
- Symmetrically, GTES Q_1 consists of all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where the left-hand side l' is a subtree of q or the right-hand side r' is a subtree of q.
- Finally, $W_1 = P_1 \cup Q_1$.

For each $i \geq 2$, we define GTESs P_i, Q_i, and W_i by adding finitely many ground instances of the equations in S, to P_{i-1}, Q_{i-1}, and W_{i-1}, respectively.

- For each $i \geq 2$, GTES P_i consists of all elements of P_{i-1} and all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where
  - the left-hand side l' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow_{P_{i-1}}^*$ descendant of p or the right-hand side r' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow_{P_{i-1}}^*$ descendant of p, and
  - $(l', r') \notin \leftrightarrow_{P_{i-1}}^*$.
- Symmetrically, for each $i \geq 2$, GTES Q_i consists of all elements of Q_{i-1} and all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where
  - the left-hand side l' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow_{Q_{i-1}}^*$ descendant of q or the right-hand side r' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow_{Q_{i-1}}^*$ descendant of q, and
  - $(l', r') \notin \leftrightarrow_{Q_{i-1}}^*$.
- For each $i \geq 2$, GTES W_i consists of all elements of W_{i-1} and all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where
  - the left-hand side l' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow_{W_{i-1}}^*$ descendant of p or q, or the right-hand side r' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow_{W_{i-1}}^*$ descendant of p or q, and
  - $(l', r') \notin \leftrightarrow_{W_{i-1}}^*$.

We show that GTESs P_i, Q_i, W_i, $i \geq 1$, have the following properties.

(a) For each $i \geq 1$, P_i, Q_i, W_i are finite sets of ground instances of the equations in S.

(b) $P_i \subseteq P_{i+1}$, $Q_i \subseteq Q_{i+1}$, $P_i \cup Q_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$, and $W_i \subseteq W_{i+1}$ for $i \geq 1$.

(c) • If $P_i = P_{i+1}$, then $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$.

• If $Q_i = Q_{i+1}$, then $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$.

• If $W_i = W_{i+1}$, then $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$.

(d) For each $i \geq 1$, P_i simulates all computations of S with length less than or equal to i starting from p. That is, for any $1 \leq n \leq i$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if

$p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_n$.

(e) Symmetrically, for each $i \geq 1$, Q_i simulates all computations of S with length less than or equal to i starting from q. That is, for any $1 \leq n \leq i$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if

$q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then $q \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_n$.

(f) For each $i \geq 1$, W_i simulates all computations of S with length less than or equal to i starting from p or q. That is, for any $1 \leq n \leq i$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$,

if $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$,

and

if $q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then $q \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$.

Our semidecision procedure computes GTESs P_i, Q_i, W_i for $i \geq 1$, step by step. In the ith step for $i \geq 1$, if $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$, then our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'yes'; otherwise if $P_i = P_{i-1}$ or $Q_i = Q_{i-1}$ or $W_i = W_{i-1}$, then our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'no'.

By Statements (a)-(f) we have the following.

• If $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$. Let i be the smallest such integer. Then in the ith step our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'yes'.

• If $P_i = P_{i-1}$ or $Q_i = Q_{i-1}$ or $W_i = W_{i-1}$ for some $i \geq 1$ and $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$, then $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$. Hence in the ith step our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'no'.

We now intuitively describe our elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of TESs. Let S be an arbitrary TES. We define the GTESs P_i, Q_i, W_i for $i \geq 1$.

GTES P_1 consists of all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where

- the left-hand side l' is a subtree of p and we obtain the right-hand side r' from r by substituting ground trees of height 0 for all variables that do not appear in l, or
- the right-hand side r' is a subtree of p and we obtain the left-hand side l' from l by substituting ground trees of height 0 for all variables that do not appear in r.

• Symmetrically, GTES Q_1 consists of all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where

- the left-hand side l' is a subtree of q and we obtain the right-hand side r' from r by substituting ground trees of height 0 for all variables that do not appear in l, or
- the right-hand side r' is a subtree of q and we obtain the left-hand side l' from l by substituting ground trees of height 0 for all variables that do not appear in r.

Finally, $W_1 = P_1 \cup Q_1$.

For each $i \geq 2$, we define P_i, Q_i, and W_i by adding finitely many ground instances of the equations in S, to P_{i-1}, Q_{i-1}, and W_{i-1}, respectively.

For each $i \geq 2$, GTES P_i consists of all elements of P_{i-1} and all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where $(l', r') \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i-1}}$, and

- the left-hand side l' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i-1}}$ descendant of p and we obtain the right-hand side r' from r by substituting ground trees of height $i-1$ for all variables that do not appear in l, or
- the right-hand side r' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i-1}}$ descendant of p and we obtain the left-hand side l' from l by substituting ground trees of height $i-1$ for all variables that do not appear in r.

Symmetrically, for each $i \geq 2$, GTES Q_i consists of all elements of Q_{i-1} and all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where $(l', r') \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_{i-1}}$ and

- the left-hand side l' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow^*_{Q_{i-1}}$ descendant of q and we obtain the right-hand side r' from r by substituting ground trees of height $i-1$ for all variables that do not appear in l or

- the right-hand side r' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow^*_{Q_{i-1}}$ descendant of q and we obtain the left-hand side l' from l by substituting ground trees of height $i-1$ for all variables that do not appear in r.

• For each $i \geq 2$, GTES W_i consists of all elements of W_{i-1} and all ground instances $l' \approx r'$ of the equations $l \approx r$ in S, where $(l', r') \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i-1}}$, and

-the left-hand side l' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i-1}}$ descendant of p or q, and we obtain the right-hand side r' from r by substituting ground trees of height $i-1$ for all variables that do not appear in l, or

- the right-hand side r' is a subtree of a $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i-1}}$ descendant of p or q, and we obtain the left-hand side l' from l by substituting ground trees of height $i-1$ for all variables that do not appear in r.

We show that GTESs P_i, Q_i, W_i, $i \geq 1$, have the following properties.

(a) For each $i \geq 1$, P_i, Q_i, W_i are finite sets of ground instances of the equations in S.

(b) $P_i \subseteq P_{i+1}$, $Q_i \subseteq Q_{i+1}$, $P_i \cup Q_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$, and $W_i \subseteq W_{i+1}$ for $i \geq 1$.

(c) Each computation of S starting from p is simulated by some P_i. For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if

$p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that

$p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_n$.

That is, P_i simulates the above computation of S.

(d) Symmetrically, each computation of S starting from q is simulated by some Q_i. For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if

$q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that

$q \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_n$.

That is, Q_i simulates the above computation of S.

(e) Each computation of S starting from p or q is simulated by some W_i. For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that

$p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$.

For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if $q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that

$p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$.

Our semidecision procedure computes GTESs P_i, Q_i, W_i for $i \geq 1$, step by step. In the ith step for $i \geq 1$, if $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$, then our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'yes'; otherwise if $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ or $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ or $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, then our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'no'.

By Statements (a)-(e) we have the following.

• If $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$. Let i be the smallest such integer. Then in the ith step our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'yes'.

• If there is $i \geq 1$ such that $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ or $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ or $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ and $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$, then $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$. Hence in the ith step our semidecision procedure halts and outputs 'no'.

If we could decide for each $i \geq 1$, whether $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, whether $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and whether $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, then the above procedure could be implemented. For each $i \geq 1$, let

h_{P_i}, h_{Q_i}, and h_{W_i} be the maximum of the heights of the trees appearing in $S \cup P_i$, $S \cup Q_i$, and $S \cup W_i$, respectively. We conjecture that

- $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{P_i}$ if and only if $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$,
- $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{Q_i}$ if and only if $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and
- $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq h_{W_i}$ if and only if $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$.

Assume that our conjecture is right. Then for an arbitrary TES S and integer $i \geq 0$, it is decidable whether $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, whether $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and whether $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence the above procedure could be implemented. However, it is still open how to prove our conjecture. Hence we modify our algorithm. We replace the condition

there is $i \geq 1$ such that $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ or $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$ or $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$

by a stronger condition, which is decidable.

4 Preliminaries

In this section we present a brief review of the notions, notation and preliminary results used in the paper.

Relations. A partial order $\prec \subseteq A \times A$ is an irreflexive and transitive relation. A total order $\prec$ is a partial order where for any elements $a, b \in A$, $a = b$ or $a \prec b$ or $b \prec a$.

Let ρ be an equivalence relation on A. Then for every $a \in A$, we denote by $[a]_\rho$ the ρ-class containing a, i.e. $[a]_\rho = \{\, b \mid a\rho b \,\}$.

Terms. A ranked alphabet Σ is a finite set of symbols in which every element has a unique rank in the set of nonnegative integers. For each integer $m \geq 0$, Σ_m denotes the elements of Σ which have rank m. We assume that there is a total oder $\prec_\Sigma$ on Σ.

Let Y be a set of variables. The set of terms over Σ with variables in Y is the smallest set U for which

(i) $\Sigma_0 \cup Y \subseteq U$ and

(ii) $f(t_1, \ldots, t_m) \in U$ whenever $f \in \Sigma_m$ with $m \geq 1$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_m \in U$.

For each $f \in \Sigma_0$, we mean f by $f()$. Terms are also called trees. The set $T_\Sigma(\emptyset)$ is written simply as T_Σ and called the set of ground trees over Σ. We define the alphabetical order $\prec_{alph}$ on T_Σ as follows. We say that $f(p_1, \ldots, p_m) \prec_{alph} g(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ if

i) $f \prec_\Sigma g$, or

ii) $f = g$, and there exists $1 \leq k \leq m$ such that $p_i = s_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $p_i \prec_{alph} s_i$.

Observe the following.

Statement 4.1 *$\prec_{alph}$ is a total oder on T_Σ.*

We specify a countably infinite set $X = \{\, x_1, x_2, \ldots \,\}$ of variables which will be kept fixed in this paper. Moreover, we put $X_n = \{\, x_1, \ldots, x_n \,\}$, for $n \geq 0$. Hence $X_0 = \emptyset$. A context is a tree $u \in T_\Sigma(X_1)$, where x_1 appears exactly once in u. We denote the set of all contexts over Σ by C_Σ.

The tree substitution operation is defined in the following way. Given a tree $t \in T_\Sigma(X_n)$, $n \geq 0$, and trees $t_1, \ldots, t_n$, we denote by $t[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ the tree which can be obtained from t by replacing each occurrence of x_i in t by t_i, for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

For a ground term $t \in T_\Sigma$, the set $sub(t)$ of subtrees of t is defined by recursion as follows:

(i) if $t \in \Sigma_0$, then $sub(t) = \{ t \}$,

(ii) if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_m)$ for some $m \geq 1$, $f \in \Sigma_m$, and $t_1, \ldots, t_m \in T_\Sigma$, then we have $sub(t) = \bigcup(sub(t_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq m) \cup \{ t \}$.

TA $= (T_\Sigma, \Sigma)$ is the algebra of ground terms over Σ, where for any $f \in \Sigma_m$ with $m \geq 0$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_m \in T_\Sigma$, we have

$$f^{\mathbf{TA}}(t_1, \ldots, t_m) = f(t_1, \ldots, t_m) \ .$$

Term equation systems. Let Σ be a ranked alphabet. Then a term equation system (TES for short) S over Σ is a finite subset of $T_\Sigma(X) \times T_\Sigma(X)$. Elements (l, r) of S are called equations and are denoted by $l \approx r$. Here we may assume without loss of generality that $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, and $k, m, \ell \geq 0$.

The word problem for S is the problem of deciding for arbitrary $s, t \in T_\Sigma(X)$ whether $s \leftrightarrow_S^* t$. The *ground word problem* for S is the word problem restricted to ground terms s and t.

Ground term rewriting systems and equation systems. A ground term rewriting system (GTRS) over a ranked alphabet Σ is a finite subset S of $T_\Sigma \times T_\Sigma$. A GTRS S is reduced if for every rule $u \to v$ in S, u is irreducible with respect to $S - \{ u \to v \}$ and v is irreducible with respect to S.

We recall the following important result.

Proposition 4.2 [10] Any reduced GTRS S is convergent.

A ground term equation system (GTES) E over a ranked alphabet Σ is also a finite binary relation on T_Σ. Elements (l, r) of E are called equations and are denoted by $l \approx r$. In case of a GTES E we consider only the congruence closure of E on **TA**, which is equal to $\leftrightarrow_E^*$. We say that a GTRS R over Σ is equivalent to E if $\leftrightarrow_R^* = \leftrightarrow_E^*$.

Proposition 4.3 [10] *For a GTES E over a ranked alphabet Σ one can effectively construct an equivalent reduced GTRS R over Σ.*

Next, we cite the following results appearing as comments after Theorem 2.21 in Section 2 in [10].

Proposition 4.4 [10] *For a GTES E there exists an equivalent, reduced GTRS with no more rules than E has equations.*

Proposition 4.5 [10] *Any two equivalent reduced GTRS have the same number of rules.*

We immediately have the following result.

Lemma 4.6 *Let E be a GTES and R be a reduced GTRS equivalent to E. Then the number of rules in R is less than or equal to the number of equations in E.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.4 there exists a reduced GTRS R' equivalent to E such that $|R'| \leq |E|$. By Proposition 4.5 $|R'| = |R|$.

□

By Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.7 [10] *For a GTES E over a ranked alphabet Σ and ground terms $s, t \in T_\Sigma$, we can decide whether $s \leftrightarrow_E^* t$.*

Tree automata. Let Σ be a ranked alphabet, a tree automaton over Σ is a quadruple $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$, where A is the finite set of states of rank 0, $\Sigma \cap A = \emptyset$. There is a total order $\prec_A$ on A. We define the ranked alphabet $\Sigma \cup A$, where the elements of A are viewed as symbols with rank 0. Recall that Σ is totally ordered by $\prec_\Sigma$. We define the total order $\prec$ on $\Sigma \cup A$ by extending the union $\prec_\Sigma \cup \prec_A$ to $\Sigma \cup A$. We require that for any $f \in \Sigma$ and $a \in A$, $f \prec a$. R is a GTRS over the ranked alphabet $\Sigma \cup A$. Moreover, each rule in R is of the form

$$f(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \to a \ , \tag{1}$$

where $f \in \Sigma_m$, $m \geq 0$, $a, a_1, \ldots, a_m \in A$.

We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is totally defined if for each $f \in \Sigma_m$, $m \geq 0$, and states $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in A$, there is a rule with left-hand side $f(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ in $\mathcal{A}$.

We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is deterministic if for any $f \in \Sigma_m$, $m \geq 0$, $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in A$, there is at most one rule with left-hand side $f(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ in $\mathcal{A}$.

A state $a \in A$ is reachable if there is a tree $t \in T_\Sigma$ such that $t \to_A^* a$. The following can be shown by applying well-known techniques of tree automaton theory, see [7].

Proposition 4.8 Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$ be a tree automaton and let $a \in A$. It is decidable whether the state a is reachable. Moreover, if a is reachable, then one can effectively construct a tree $s \in T_\Sigma$ such that $s \to_A^* a$.

We say that a tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$ over Σ is connected if each state in A is reachable.

Let $b, c \in A$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ reaches b starting from c if there is a context $u \in C_\Sigma$ such that $u[c] \to_A^* b$. Let $REACH(c)$ denotes the set of all states b which are reachable by $\mathcal{A}$ starting from c.

Proposition 4.9 *Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$ be a tree automaton and let $c \in A$. We can effectively compute $REACH(c)$.*

Proof. Let $REACH_0 = \{ c \}$. For each $i \geq 0$, let

$$REACH_{i+1} = REACH_i \cup \{ a \mid \text{ there is a rule (1) and } a_j \in REACH_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq j \leq n \} \ .$$

Then $REACH_i \subseteq REACH_{i+1} \subseteq A$ for $i \geq 0$. Hence there is an integer $0 \leq j \leq card(A)$ such that $REACH_j = REACH_{j+1}$. Then $REACH_j = REACH_{j+k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence $REACH_j = REACH(c)$. We compute the sets $REACH_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq j+1$. In this way we get $REACH(c)$.

□

By Proposition 4.9, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.10 *Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$ be a tree automaton and let $b, c \in A$. We can decide whether $\mathcal{A}$ reaches b starting from c.*

Definition 4.11 Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$ be a deterministic tree automaton. We define the rule order $\prec_{rul}$ on R as follows.

$f(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \to a \prec_{alph} g(b_1, \ldots, b_n) \to b$
if and only if
$f(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \prec_{alph} g(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$

Statement 4.12 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\prec_{rul}$ be as in Definition 4.11. Then the rule order $\prec_{rul}$ on R is a total order.*

Proof. By Statement 4.1, the alphabetical order $\prec_{alph}$ is a total order on $T_{\Sigma\cup A}$. Hence $\prec_{rul}$ is a total order on R.

□.

Proposition 4.13 Let $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$ be a tree automaton. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is deterministic if and only if $\mathcal{A}$ is a reduced GTRS over the ranked alphabet $\Sigma \cup A$.

Proof. By direct inspection of the rules of $\mathcal{A}$.

□

5 Ground term equation systems and tree automata

We recall some results of Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4, 5, 12] on the connections between GTESs and tree automata. Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4] gave a simple and efficient algorithm which, given a GTES E over a ranked alphabet Σ, produces a connected deterministic tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$ with the property that $\leftrightarrow^*_E = \leftrightarrow^*_R \cap T_\Sigma \times T_\Sigma$. Their algorithm calls a congruence closure procedure over the subterm graph of E and runs in $O(n \log n)$ time, where n is the size of E. Vágvölgyi [12] adopted and slightly generalized this algorithm.

Let E be a GTES, and let $p_1, \ldots, p_k$, $k \geq 1$, be ground terms over a ranked alphabet Σ. Let

$$T = \{\, t \in T_\Sigma \mid t \in sub(l) \cup sub(r) \text{ for some } l \approx r \text{ in } E \text{ or } t \in sub(p_i) \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq k \,\}$$

be the set of subterms occurring in E or some p_i and let $\Theta(E) = \leftrightarrow^*_E \cap T \times T$. When E is understood from the context, we simply write Θ for $\Theta(E)$. It should be clear that Θ is an equivalence relation on T. Moreover, for each $t \in T$, $[t]_\Theta = [t]_{\leftrightarrow^*_E} \cap T$. We put $A = \{[t]_\Theta \mid t \in T\}$. We define the ranked alphabet $\Sigma \cup A$, where the elements of A are viewed as symbols with rank 0. We have $[s]_\Theta \prec [t]_\Theta$ if and only if the $\prec_\Sigma$-minimal element of $[s]_\Theta$ and the $\prec_\Sigma$-minimal element of $[t]_\Theta$ are in the $\prec_S$ relation.

Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4, 12] introduced the GTRS R over $\Sigma \cup A$ as follows. Let R be the set of rules of the form

$$f([t_1]_\Theta, \ldots, [t_m]_\Theta) \to [f(t_1, \ldots, t_m)]_\Theta \ ,$$

where $f(t_1, \ldots, t_m) \in T$. Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4, 12] showed the following properties of R.

Proposition 5.1 [4, 12] *R is reduced.*

Proposition 5.2 [4, 12] *For every $t \in T$, we have $t \to^*_R [t]_\theta$.*

Proposition 5.3 [4, 12] *For all $s \in T_\Sigma$ and $t \in T$, if $s \to^*_R [t]_\Theta$, then $s \leftrightarrow^*_E t$.*

Proposition 5.4 [4, 12] $\leftrightarrow^*_E = \leftrightarrow^*_R \cap T_\Sigma \times T_\Sigma$.

Consider the tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$. We call $\mathcal{A}$ the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES E and the ground terms $p_1, \ldots, p_k$, $k \geq 1$, over the ranked alphabet Σ.

Statement 5.5 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with an arbitrary GTES E and arbitrary ground terms $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ over the ranked alphabet Σ. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is deterministic and connected. Moreover, GTRS R is convergent.*

Proof. By Propositions 4.13 and 5.1 $\mathcal{A}$ is deterministic. By Proposition 5.2 $\mathcal{A}$ is a connected. By Propositions 4.2 and 5.1, GTRS R is convergent.

□

By Statement 5.5, there exists a unique R-normal form for each ground term $s \in T_\Sigma$, which is denoted by $s\downarrow$. Note that $s\downarrow$ may contain symbols of Σ and symbols of A as well.

Proposition 5.6 [4, 12] *For any $s, t \in T_\Sigma$, $s \leftrightarrow_E^* t$ if and only if $s\downarrow = t\downarrow$.*

Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4] gave another proof for Proposition 4.7. Let $s, t \in T_\Sigma$ be arbitrary. We compute R-normal forms $s\downarrow$ and $t\downarrow$. Then we compare $s\downarrow$ and $t\downarrow$. By Proposition 5.6, $s \leftrightarrow_E^* t$ if and only if $s\downarrow = t\downarrow$.

By the definition of R and Propositions 5.2 for any $s, t \in T$, we have $s\downarrow = [s]_\Theta$ and $t\downarrow = [t]_\Theta$. Hence we have the following result.

Proposition 5.7 *For all $s, t \in T$, $[s]_\Theta = t_\Theta$ if and only if $s \leftrightarrow_E^* t$.*

Vágvölgyi [12] showed that $\mathcal{A}$ recognizes the congruential tree language $[p_1]_{\leftrightarrow_E^*} \cup \cdots [p_k]_{\leftrightarrow_E^*}$.

Proposition 5.8 [12] $L(\mathcal{A}) = [p_1]_{\leftrightarrow_E^*} \cup \cdots [p_k]_{\leftrightarrow_E^*}$.

The proof of Theorem 3.6 in [12] shows the following result.

Proposition 5.9 *For every $t \in T_\Sigma$ and every $1 \leq j \leq k$, $t \rightarrow_R^* [p_j]_\theta$ if and only if $t \leftrightarrow_E^* p_j$.*

Fülöp and Vágvölgyi [4, 12] presented an algorithm that produces the tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 5.10 [4, 12] *We have an algorithm which, given a GTES E and ground terms $p_1, \ldots, p_k$, $k \geq 1$, over a ranked alphabet Σ, produces the congruence class computing tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$ associated with the GTES E and the ground terms $p_1, \ldots, p_k$.*

Proposition 5.11 [5] *We have an algorithm which, given a connected deterministic tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Sigma, R)$, outputs for every $a \in A$, a ground term $tree(a) \in T_\Sigma$ such that $tree(a) \rightarrow_R^* a$.*

Proof. Consider the following algorithm.

Algorithm 5.12

Input: A connected deterministic tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$.

Output: For every $a \in A$, a tree $tree(a) \in T_\Sigma$ such that $tree(a) \rightarrow_R^* a$.

Auxiliary variables: For every $a \in A$, a boolean flag $flag(a)$, which indicates whether or not $tree(a)$ has been defined.

```
        for every $a \in A$, let $flag(a) = false$;
        while there is an $a \in A$ with $flag(a) = false$ do
    begin
```

```
        consider the rules of $R$, one by one, in the order $\prec_{rul}$;
        for every rule $f(a_1,\ldots,a_m) \to a$ in $R$ do
        if $flag(a_1) = \ldots = flag(a_m) = true$ and $flag(a) = false$,
            then begin
                $tree(a) := f(tree(a_1),\ldots,tree(a_m))$;
                $flag(a) := true$
            end
    end
```

As $\mathcal{A}$ is connected, Algorithm 5.12 terminates with $flag(a) = true$, for all $a \in A$. By direct inspection of Algorithm 5.12, we get that for every $a \in A$, $tree(a) \to_R^* a$.

□

6 Elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of variable preserving TESs

Let S be a variable preserving TES over Σ, and let $p, q \in T_\Sigma$. We now define the GTESs W_i, $i \geq 1$, over Σ. We define the GTES W_1 as follows. For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l, r \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and for any $u \in C_\Sigma$, $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, if $p = u[l[u_1,\ldots,u_m]]$ or $p = u[r[u_1,\ldots,u_m]]$ or $q = u[l[u_1,\ldots,u_m]]$ or $q = u[r[u_1,\ldots,u_m]]$, then we put the equation $l[u_1,\ldots,u_m] \approx r[u_1,\ldots,u_m]$ in W_1.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define W_{i+1} from W_i in the following way. Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES W_i and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ.

(1) We put each equation of W_i into W_{i+1}.

(2) Applying the algorithm of Proposition 5.11, for every $a \in A_i$, we compute the ground term $tree(a) \in T_\Sigma$ such that $tree(a) \to_{R_i}^* a$. For each equation $l \approx r$ of S, $l, r \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, for any states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$, if

$l[a_1,\ldots,a_m] \to_{R_i}^* a$ or $r[a_1,\ldots,a_m] \to_{R_i}^* a$,

$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a or $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[q]_\Theta$ starting from a, and

$(l[tree(a_1),\ldots,tree(a_m)], r[tree(a_1),\ldots,tree(a_m)]) \notin \leftrightarrow_{W_i}^*$,

then we put the equation $l[tree(a_1),\ldots,tree(a_m)] \approx r[tree(a_1),\ldots,tree(a_m)]$ in W_{i+1}.

We shall illustrate our concepts and results by our first running example, which is presented as a series of examples.

Example 6.1 Let $\Sigma = \Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_1$, $\Sigma_0 = \{\,\$\,\}$, $\Sigma_1 = \{\, e, f, g, h \,\}$, and $\$ \prec h \prec g \prec f \prec e$. Let TES S consist of the following equations:

$e(h(x_1)) \to h(x_1)$, $f(h(x_1)) \to h(x_1)$, $g(h(x_1)) \to h(x_1)$, $f(f(x_1) \to g(g(x_1))$.

Observe that S is variable preserving. Let $p = e(f(g(h(\$))))$, $q = e(h(\$))$. Then

- $W_1 = \{\, g(h(\$)) \approx h(\$), e(h(\$)) \approx h(\$) \,\}$.

$\mathcal{A}_1 = (A_1, \Sigma, R_1)$.

– $A_1 = \{\, [\$]_\theta, [h(\$)]_\theta, [e(f(h(\$)))]_\theta, [e(h(\$))]_\theta \,\}$.

– $[\$]_\theta \prec [h(\$)]_\theta \prec [e(h(\$))]_\theta \prec [e(f(h(\$)))]_\theta$.

– R_1 consists of the following rules:

$h([\$]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$g([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$f([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [f(h(\$))]_\theta$,
$e([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$e([f(h(\$))]_\theta) \to [e(f(h(\$)))]_\theta$.
• $W_2 = \{ g(h(\$)) \approx h(\$), e(h(\$)) \approx h(\$), f(h(\$)) \approx h(\$) \}$. Observe that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_2} q$.
$\mathcal{A}_2 = (A_2, \Sigma, R_2)$.
− $A_2 = \{ [\$]_\theta, [h(\$)]_\theta, [e(h(\$))]_\theta \}$.
− $[\$]_\theta \prec [h(\$)]_\theta \prec [e(h(\$))]_\theta$.
− R_2 consists of the following rules:
$h([\$]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$g([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$f([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$e([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$.
• $W_3 = W_2$ and $\mathcal{A}_3 = \mathcal{A}_2$.

We get the following result by direct inspection of the definition of GTES W_i, $i \geq 1$.

Lemma 6.2 *For each $i \geq 1$, $W_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow_S$.*

Lemma 6.3 *For each $i \geq 1$, we can effectively construct the GTES W_i.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.10, we construct $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$. By Proposition 4.10, we can effectively decide for any $a \in A_i$ whether $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a and whether $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[q]_\Theta$ starting from a. Recall that $\mathcal{A}_i$ is a reduced GTRS. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}_i$ and Proposition 5.6,
$(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]) \in \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$
if and only if
$l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]{\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_i}} = r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]{\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_i}}$.
Hence we can decide whether $(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]) \in \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$.

□

Lemma 6.4 *(a) For any $i \geq 1$, $u \in C_\Sigma$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ if and only if there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that*
- *$u_j \to^*_{R_i} a_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.*
- *$l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{R_i} a$, and*
- *$u[a] \to^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.*

(b) For any $i \geq 1$, $u \in C_\Sigma$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, $i \geq 1$, $q \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ if and only if there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that
- *$u_j \to^*_{R_i} a_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.*
- *$l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{R_i} a$, and*
- *$u[a] \to^*_{R_i} [q]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.*

Proof. First we show (a). (⇒) Let $i \geq 1$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$ be arbitray. Assume that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$. Then by Proposition 5.9, $u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \to^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$. Hence there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that
- $u_j \to^*_{R_i} a_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.

- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{R_i} a$, and
- $u[a] \to^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $i \geq 1$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$ be arbitray. Assume that there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that

- $u_j \to^*_{R_i} a_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{R_i} a$, and
- $u[a] \to^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.

Then $u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \to^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$. By Proposition 5.9, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$.

The proof of (b) is symmetric to the proof of (a).

□

We now define the GTESs P_i, $i \geq 1$, over Σ. We define the GTES P_1 as follows. For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l, r \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and for any $u \in C_\Sigma$, $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, if $p = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ or $p = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$, then we put the equation $l[u_1, \ldots, u_m] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_m]$ in P_1.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define P_{i+1} from P_i in the following way. Let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES P_i, and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ. Then $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$.

(1) We put each equation of P_i into P_{i+1}.

(2) Applying the algorithm of Proposition 5.11, for every $a \in A_i$, we compute the ground term $tree(a) \in T_\Sigma$ such that $tree(a) \to^*_{R_i} a$.
For each equation $l \approx r$ of S, $l, r \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, for any states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$, if
$l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{R_i} a$ or $r[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{R_i} a$,
$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a, and
$(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$,
then we put the equation $l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)] \approx r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]$ in P_{i+1}.

Example 6.5 We continue our running example.

- $P_1 = \{\, g(h(\$)) \approx h(\$) \,\}$.
  $\mathcal{A}_1 = (A_1, \Sigma, R_1)$.
  − $A_1 = \{\, [\$]_\theta, [h(\$)]_\theta, [f(h(\$))]_\theta, [e(f(h(\$)))]_\theta \,\}$.
  − $[\$]_\theta \prec [h(\$)]_\theta \prec [f(h(\$))]_\theta \prec [e(f(h(\$)))]_\theta$.
  − R_1 consists of the following rules:
  $h([\$]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
  $g([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
  $f([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [f(h(\$))]_\theta$,
  $e([f(h(\$))]_\theta) \to [e(f(h(\$)))]_\theta$.
- $P_2 = \{\, g(h(\$)) \approx h(\$), f(h(\$)) \approx h(\$) \,\}$. Observe that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_2} q$.
  $\mathcal{A}_2 = (A_2, \Sigma, R_2)$.
  − $A_2 = \{\, [\$]_\theta, [h(\$)]_\theta, [e(h(\$))]_\theta \,\}$.
  − $[\$]_\theta \prec [h(\$)]_\theta \prec [e(h(\$))]_\theta$.
  − R_2 consists of the following rules:
  $h([\$]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
  $g([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
  $f([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
  $e([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [e(h(\$))]_\theta$.
- $P_3 = \{\, g(h(\$)) \approx h(\$), f(h(\$)) \approx h(\$), e(h(\$)) \approx h(\$) \,\}$.

$\mathcal{A}_3 = (A_3, \Sigma, R_3)$.
– $A_3 = \{ [\$]_\theta, [h(\$)]_\theta \}$.
– $[\$]_\theta \prec [h(\$)]_\theta$.
– R_3 consists of the following rules:
$h([\$]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$g([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$f([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$,
$e([h(\$)]_\theta) \to [h(\$)]_\theta$.

- $P_4 = P_3$ and $\mathcal{A}_4 = \mathcal{A}_3$.

We get the following result by direct inspection of the definition of the GTES P_i, $i \geq 1$.

Lemma 6.6 *For each* $i \geq 1$, $P_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow_S$.

We can show the following result in the same way as Lemma 6.3.

Lemma 6.7 *For each* $i \geq 1$, *we can effectively construct the GTES* P_i.

We can show the following result in the same way as Lemma 6.4.

Lemma 6.8 *For any* $i \geq 1$, $u \in C_\Sigma$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, *and* $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ *if and only if there are states* $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ *such that*

- $u_j \to^*_{R_i} a_j$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq m$.
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{R_i} a$, *and*
- $u[a] \to^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(P_i)}$.

The definition of the GTESs Q_i, $i \geq 1$, over Σ is symmetric to the definition of the GTESs P_i, $i \geq 1$. That is, we obtain the definition of the GTESs Q_i, $i \geq 1$, from the definition of the GTESs P_i, $i \geq 1$, by substituting p for q.

By Lemma 6.6 we have the following.

Lemma 6.9 *For each* $i \geq 1$, $Q_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow_S$.

By Lemma 6.7 we have the following.

Lemma 6.10 *For each* $i \geq 1$, *we can effectively construct the GTES* Q_i.

By Lemma 6.8 we have the following.

Lemma 6.11 *For any* $i \geq 1$, $u \in C_\Sigma$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, $u \in C_\Sigma$, *and* $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ *if and only if there are states* $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ *such that*

- $u_j \to^*_{\mathcal{A}_i} a_j$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq m$,
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \to^*_{\mathcal{A}_i} a$, *and*
- $u[a] \to^*_{\mathcal{A}_i} [p]_{\Theta(Q_i)}$.

Statement 6.12 *For each* $i \geq 1$, $W_i \subseteq W_{i+1}$, $P_i \subseteq P_{i+1}$, *and* $Q_i \subseteq Q_{i+1}$.

Proof. By direct inspection of the definition of the GTESs W_i, P_i, and Q_i, $i \geq 1$.

□

Statement 6.13 *If* $W_i = W_{i+1}$ *for some* $i \geq 1$*, then* $W_i = W_{i+j}$ *for* $j \geq 0$*.*
If $P_i = P_{i+1}$ *for some* $i \geq 1$*, then* $P_i = P_{i+j}$ *for* $j \geq 0$*.*
If $Q_i = Q_{i+1}$ *for some* $i \geq 1$*, then* $Q_i = Q_{i+j}$ *for* $j \geq 0$*.*

Proof. By direct inspection of the definition of the GTESs W_i, P_i, and Q_i, $i \geq 1$.

□

We now present our semi-decision procedure.

Procedure 6.14

```
Input: A variable preserving TES $S$ over the ranked alphabet $\Sigma$ and ground terms $p, q \in T_\Sigma$.
Output: • 'yes' and the procedure halts if $p \leftrightarrow_S^* q$,
• 'no' if the procedure halts and $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow_S^* q$,
• undefined if the procedure does not halt.
$i := 1$;
Compute $W_1$, $P_1$, and $Q_1$;
if $p \leftrightarrow_{W_1}^* q$, then begin output 'yes'; halt end;
1: $i := i + 1$;
Compute $W_i$, $P_i$, and $Q_i$;
if $p \leftrightarrow_{W_i}^* q$, then begin output 'yes'; halt end;
if $W_i = W_{i-1}$ or $P_i = P_{i-1}$ or $Q_i = Q_{i-1}$, then
        begin output 'no'; halt end;
goto 1
```

Example 6.15 As for our running example, Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'yes' in the second step because $p \leftrightarrow_{W_2}^* q$.

Lemma 6.16 *For any* $1 \leq n \leq i$*,* $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$*, if* $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$*, then* $p \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* t_1 \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* t_2 \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* \cdots \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* t_n$*.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on i.

Base Case: $i = 1$. Then by the definition of P_1, we have $p \leftrightarrow_{P_1} t_1$.

Induction Step: Let $i \geq 1$, and assume that the satement holds for $1, 2, \ldots, i$. We now show that the satement holds for $i + 1$. To this end, assume that

$$p \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} t_1 \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} t_2 \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} \cdots \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} t_{n+1} \text{ for some } 0 \leq n \leq i + 1\,. \tag{2}$$

By the induction hypothesis, $p \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* t_1 \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* t_2 \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* \cdots \leftrightarrow_{P_i}^* t_n$.
Hence

$$[p]_{\leftrightarrow_{P_i}^*} = [t_n]_{\leftrightarrow_{P_i}^*}\,. \tag{3}$$

By Statement 6.12,

$$p \underset{P_{i+1}}{\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}} t_1 \underset{P_{i+1}}{\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}} t_2 \underset{P_{i+1}}{\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}} \cdots \underset{P_{i+1}}{\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}} t_n\,. \tag{4}$$

Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES P_i, and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ. By Proposition 5.2

$$p \underset{R_i}{\overset{*}{\rightarrow}} [p]_{\leftrightarrow_{P_i}^*}\,. \tag{5}$$

Hence by (3) and Proposition 5.6

$$t_n \underset{R_i}{\overset{*}{\rightarrow}} [p]_{\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}} \,. \tag{6}$$

By (2), there is an equation $l \approx r$ in S with $l, r \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$ and there are $u \in C_\Sigma$, $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$ such that

$$t_n = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \text{ and } t_{n+1} = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \tag{7}$$

or

$$t_{n+1} = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \text{ and } t_n = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \,. \tag{8}$$

First, assume that (7) holds. Then by (6) and (7), $l[u_1, \ldots, u_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$ for some state $a \in A_i$, where

$$\text{for each } j = 1, \ldots, m, \; u_j \underset{R_i}{\overset{*}{\rightarrow}} a_j \text{ for some state } a_j \in A_i \,. \tag{9}$$

Moreover, $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$, and $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a. Hence the equation
$l[\mathit{tree}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(a_m)] \approx r[\mathit{tree}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(a_m)]$
is in $\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} \cup P_{i+1}$. By Proposition 5.11, for each $j = 1, \ldots m$, $\mathit{tree}(a_j) \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$. Hence by (9) and Proposition 5.4,

$$\text{for each } j = 1, \ldots, m, \; u_j \underset{P_i}{\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}} \mathit{tree}(a_j) \,. \tag{10}$$

By (10) and Statement 6.12,
$t_n = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} u[l[\mathit{tree}(u_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(u_m)]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}}$
$u[r[\mathit{tree}(u_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(u_m)]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] = t_{n+1}$.
By (4), $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_n \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_{n+1}$.

Second, assume that (8) holds. This case is similar to the first case.

□

By Lemma 6.6, Statement 6.13, and Lemma 6.16 we have the following result.

Lemma 6.17 *Assume that* $P_i = P_{i+1}$ *for some* $i \geq 1$. *Then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} q$ *if and only if* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

Lemma 6.18 *For any* $1 \leq n \leq i$, *for any* $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, *if* $q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, *then* $q \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_n$.

Proof. Symmetric to the proof of Lemma 6.16.

□

By Lemma 6.17, we have the following.

Lemma 6.19 *Assume that* $Q_i = Q_{i+1}$ *for some* $i \geq 1$. *Then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} q$ *if and only if* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

Theorem 6.20 *For each* $i \geq 1$, $P_i \cup Q_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$.

Proof. First we show that $P_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ for $i \geq 1$. We proceed by induction on i.

Base Case: $i = 1$. Then by the definition of P_1 and W_1, we have $P_1 \subseteq W_1$.

Induction Step: Let $i \geq 1$, and assume that the satement holds for $1, 2, \ldots, i$. We now show that the satement holds for $i + 1$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES P_i, and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ. Let $l' \approx r'$ be an arbitrary equation in P_{i+1}. Then, by the definition of P_{i+1}, there is an equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l, r \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that

- $l' \approx r'$ is of the form

$$l[tree_{P_i}(a_1), \ldots, tree_{P_i}(a_m)] \approx r[tree_{P_i}(a_1), \ldots, tree_{P_i}(a_m)] \ . \tag{11}$$

- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$ or $r[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$,
- $u[a] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(P_i)}$, and
- $(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$.

First assume that $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$. Then by Lemma 6.8, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} u[l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]]$. By the induction hypothesis,

$$p \underset{W_i}{\overset{*}{\leftrightarrow}} u[l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_m)]] \ . \tag{12}$$

Let $\mathcal{A}_{W_i} = (A_{W_i}, \Sigma, R_{W_i})$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES W_i, and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ. By (12) and Lemma 6.4, there are states $b_1, \ldots, b_m, b \in A_{W_i}$ such that

(a) $tree_{P_i}(a_j) \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} b_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$,

(b) $l[b_1, \ldots, b_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} b$, and

(c) $u[b] \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.

By the definition of W_{i+1}, if the equation

$l[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_m)] \approx r[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_m)]$

is not in $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$, then it is in W_{i+1}. Hence

(d) the equation

$l[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_m)] \approx r[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_m)]$

is in $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cup W_{i+1}$.

Recall that for the trees $tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_m)$ we have

(e) $tree_{W_i}(b_j) \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} b_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.

By (a) and (e) and Proposition 5.3, $tree_{P_i}(a_j) \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} tree_{W_i}(b_j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq k + m$. Hence by (d) and Statement 6.12 , the equation (11) is in $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i+1}}$. Recall that (11) is an arbitrary equation in P_{i+1}. Hence $P_{i+1} \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i+1}}$.

The proof of the inclusion $Q_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ for $i \geq 1$, is symmetric to the proof of the inclusion $P_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ for $i \geq 1$.

□

Lemma 6.16, Lemma 6.18, and Theorem 6.20, imply the following result.

Lemma 6.21 *For any* $1 \leq n \leq i$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$,

if $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, *then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$,

and

if $q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, *then* $q \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$.

By Lemma 6.2, Statement 6.13, and Lemma 6.21 we have the following result.

Lemma 6.22 *Assume that* $W_i = W_{i+1}$ *for some* $i \geq 1$. *Then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$ *if and only if* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

Theorem 6.23 *If $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$, then Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'yes'.*

Proof. If $p = q$, then $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_1} q$. Assume that $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n = q$ for some $n \geq 1$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$. By Lemma 6.21, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_n} q$. Let k be the least integer such that such that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_k} q$.

First assume that $k = 1$. Then $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_1} q$. Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'yes'.

Second assume that $k \geq 2$. Then by the definition of k, $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ for $2 \leq i \leq k - 1$. By Theorem 6.20, $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} \cup \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i}$ for $2 \leq i \leq k - 1$. By Lemmas 6.17, 6.19, 6.22, $P_{i-1} \subset P_i$, $Q_{i-1} \subset Q_i$ and $W_{i-1} \subset W_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq k$. Hence Procedure 6.14 does not halt in the first $k - 1$ steps. By the definition of the integer k, in the kth step Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'yes'.

$\square$

Theorem 6.24 *If Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'yes', then $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$. If Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'no', then $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$.*

Proof. Assume that Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'yes' in the kth step. Then $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_k} q$. By Lemma 6.2, $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

Assume that Procedure 6.14 halts and outputs 'no' in the kth step. Then
(a) $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_k}$ and
(b) $W_k = W_{k-1}$ or $P_k = P_{k-1}$ or $Q_k = Q_{k-1}$.

We now distinguish three cases.

Case 1: $W_k = W_{k-1}$. By (a) and by Lemma 6.22, $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$.

Case 2: $P_k = P_{k-1}$. By (a) and Lemma 6.17, $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$.

Case 3: $Q_k = Q_{k-1}$. This case is symmetric to Case 2.

$\square$

Note that we can speed up Procedure 6.14 in the following way. For each $i \geq 1$, at the end of the ith step, we construct the reduced GTRSs W'_i, P'_i, Q'_i over Σ such that W'_i, P'_i, Q'_i are equivalent to the GTESs W_i, P_i, Q_i, respectively see Proposition 4.3. By Proposition 4.6, the number of equations in W'_i, P'_i, Q'_i is less than or equal to the number of equations in W_i, P_i, Q_i, respectively. Then we let $W_i = W'_i$, $P_i = P'_i$, and $Q_i = Q'_i$. This change does not affect the partial function computed by the procedure.

7 Elementary semi-decision procedure for the ground word problem of TESs

Let S be a TES over Σ, and let $p, q \in T_\Sigma$. We now define the GTESs W_i, $i \geq 1$, over Σ. We define the GTES W_1 as follows. For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, and for any $u \in C_\Sigma$, $u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m} \in T_\Sigma$, $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell} \in \Sigma_0$, if

$p = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}]]$ or $p = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]]$ or $q = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}]]$ or $q = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]]$,

then we put the equation $l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]$ in W_1.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define W_{i+1} from W_i in the following way.

- Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES W_i and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ.
- Let $NORM^{(i)}_0$ be set of the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of the elements of Σ_0. For each $j = 1, \ldots, i$, $NORM^{(i)}_j$ is the smallest set U for which

(i) $NORM^{(i)}_{j-1} \subseteq U$, and

(ii) U contains the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of all terms $f(z_1, \dots z_m)$, where $f \in \Sigma_m$, $m \geq 1$, $z_1, \dots, z_m \in NORM^{(i)}_{j-1}$.

• Applying the algorithm of Proposition 5.11, for every $a \in A_i$, we compute a ground term $tree_i(a) \in T_\Sigma$ such that $tree_i(a) \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$. For each $z \in T_{\Sigma \cup A_i}$, we define $tree_i(z)$ by replacing all occurrences of each state $a \in A_i$ with $tree_i(a)$.

• Let $REP_i = \{\, tree_i(w) | w \in NORM^{(i)}_i \,\}$.

(i) We put each equation of W_i into W_{i+1}.

(ii) For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, for any states $a_1, \dots, a_{k+m}, a \in A_i$, and for any $v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+\ell} \in REP_i$, if

$l[a_1, \dots, a_{k+m}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$,

$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$ starting from a or $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[q]_{\Theta(W_i)}$ starting from a, and

$(l[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_{k+m})], r[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+\ell}]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$,

then we put the equation

$l[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_{k+m})] \approx r[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+\ell}]$

in W_{i+1}.

(iii) For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, for any states $a_1, \dots, a_{k+\ell}, a \in A_i$, and for any $v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+m} \in REP_i$, if

$r[a_1, \dots, a_{k+\ell}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$,

$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$ starting from a or $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[q]_{\Theta(W_i)}$ starting from a, and

$(l[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+m}], r[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_{k+\ell})]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$,

then we put the equation

$l[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \dots, v_{k+m}] \approx r[tree(a_1), \dots, tree(a_{k+\ell})]$

in W_{i+1}.

We shall illustrate our concepts and results by our running example, which is presented as a series of examples.

Example 7.1 Let $\Sigma = \Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_1$, $\Sigma_0 = \{\, 0, 1 \,\}$, and $\Sigma_2 = \{\, f \,\}$, and $0 \prec 1 \prec f$. Let $p = 0$ and $q = f(0,1)$. Let $t \in T_\Sigma$ be a ground term. If the symbol 1 appears an even number of times in t, then we say that t is even, Otherwise, we say that t is odd. Let TES S consist of the following equations:

$f(x_1, x_1) \approx 0$, $f(0, x_1) \approx x_1$, $f(x_1, 0) \approx x_1$.

By direct inspection of S, we get that for all ground terms $s, t \in T_\Sigma$, if $s \leftrightarrow_S t$, then s and t are both even or both odd. GTES W_1 consists of the following rules:

$f(0,0) \approx 0$, $f(1,1) \approx 0$, $f(0,1) \approx 1$, $f(1,0) \approx 1$.

We obtain the GTRS Z by directing the equations of W_1. GTRS Z consists of the following equations:

$f(0,0) \rightarrow 0$, $f(0,1) \rightarrow 1$, $f(0,0) \rightarrow 0$, $f(1,0) \rightarrow 1$.

Observe that $Z = W_1$ and Z is reduced. By Proposition 4.2, Z is convergent. For each tree $t \in T_\Sigma$, $t \rightarrow^*_Z 0$ if and only if t is an even tree. For each $t \in T_\Sigma$, $t \rightarrow^*_Z 1$ if and only if t is an odd tree. Hence $[0]_{\leftrightarrow^*_Z}$ is the set of all even trees, and $[1]_{\leftrightarrow^*_Z}$ is the set of all odd trees. Since $Z = W_1$, we have $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_1} = \leftrightarrow^*_Z$. Thus $\mathcal{A}_{W_1} = (A_1, \Sigma, R_1)$, where $A_1 = \{\, [0]_{\Theta(W_1)}, [1]_{\Theta(W_1)} \,\}$. R_1 consists of the rules

$0 \rightarrow [0]_{\Theta(W_1)}$, $1 \rightarrow [1]_{\Theta(W_1)}$,

$f([0]_{\Theta(W_1)}, [0]_{\Theta(W_1)}) \rightarrow [0]_{\Theta(W_1)}$, $f([0]_{\Theta(W_1)}, [1]_{\Theta(W_1)}) \rightarrow [1]_{\Theta(W_1)}$,

$f([1]_{\Theta(W_1)}, [0]_{\Theta(W_1)}) \rightarrow [1]_{\Theta(W_1)}$, $f([1]_{\Theta(W_1)}, [1]_{\Theta(W_1)}) \rightarrow [0]_{\Theta(W_1)}$.

Then $\mathcal{A}_1$ is totally defined. $NORM^{(1)}_0 = NORM^{(1)}_1 = A_1$ and $REP_1 = \{\, 0, 1 \,\}$.

Statement 7.2 *For each $i \geq 1$, W_i is a finite set of ground instances of the equations in S.*

Lemma 7.3 *For each $i \geq 1$, we can effectively construct the GTES W_i.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.10, we construct $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$. By Proposition 4.10, we can effectively decide for any $a \in A_i$ whether $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a and whether $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[q]_\Theta$ starting from a. Recall that $\mathcal{A}_i$ is a reduced GTRS.

Consider the Part (ii) of the definition of the GTES W_{i+1}. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}_i$ and Proposition 5.6,

$(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+m})], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]) \in \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$

if and only if

$l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+m})]{\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_i}} = r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]{\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}_i}}$.

Hence we can decide whether $l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m}] \approx r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+\ell})] \in \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$.

The proof for Part (iii) of the definition of the GTES W_{i+1} is similar to the proof for Part (ii).

☐

Statement 7.4 *For all $i \geq 1$, $j = 0, \ldots, i$, $NORM^{(i)}_j$ is the set of the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of all terms of height less than or equal to j.*

Proof. Let $i \geq 1$ be arbitrary. We proceed by induction on $j = 0, \ldots, i$.

Base Case: $j = 0$. Then by the definition of $NORM^{(i)}_0$, we are done.

Induction Step: Let $j \geq 1$, and assume that the satement holds for $1, 2, \ldots, j-1$. Let $s \in T_\Sigma$ be such that $height(s) = j$. Then $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$, $f \in \Sigma_m$, $m \geq 1$, $s_1, \ldots, s_m \in T_\Sigma$. By the induction hypothesis, the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of $s_1, \ldots, s_m$ are in $NORM^{(i)}_{j-1}$. By the definition of $NORM^{(i)}_j$, the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal form of the term $f(s_1, \ldots s_m)$ is in $NORM^{(i)}_j$.

☐

Statement 7.5 *For all $i \geq 1$, if $W_i = W_{i+1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_i$ is totally defined, then $W_{i+1} = W_{i+2}$ and $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$.*

Proof. Let $i \geq 1$ and assume that $W_i = W_{i+1}$ and that $\mathcal{A}_i$ is totally defined. Then $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$. Thus $A_i = NORM^{(i)}_i = NORM^{(i+1)}_{i+1}$. Hence $REP_i = REP_{i+1}$. Hence by the definition of W_{i+1} and W_{i+2}, we get that $W_{i+1} = W_{i+2}$.

☐

By Statement 7.5, we have the following.

Statement 7.6 *For all $i \geq 1$, if $W_i = W_{i+1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_i$ is totally defined, then $W_i = W_{i+k}$ and $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$.*

Example 7.7 We continue our running example. Recall that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is totally defined. It is not hard to see that $W_1 = W_2$. By Statement 7.6, $W_1 = W_k$ for $k \geq 2$.

Lemma 7.8 *(a) For any* $i \geq 1$*,* $u \in C_\Sigma$*,* $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$*,* $m \geq 0$*,* $u \in C_\Sigma$*, and* $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$*,* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ *if and only if there are states* $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ *such that*

- $u_j \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq m$*.*
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$*, and*
- $u[a] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$*.*

(b) For any $i \geq 1$*,* $u \in C_\Sigma$*,* $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$*,* $m \geq 0$*, and* $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$*,* $i \geq 1$*,* $q \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ *if and only if there are states* $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ *such that*

- $u_j \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq m$*.*
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$*, and*
- $u[a] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [q]_{\Theta(W_i)}$*.*

Proof. First we show (a). ($\Rightarrow$) Let $i \geq 1$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$ be arbitray. Assume that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$. Then by Proposition 5.9, $u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$. Hence there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that

- $u_j \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$, and
- $u[a] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $i \geq 1$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$ be arbitray. Assume that there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that

- $u_j \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$, and
- $u[a] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.

Then $u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$. By Proposition 5.9, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$.

The proof of (b) is symmetric to the proof of (a).

□

When misunderstanding may arise, we denote $\mathcal{A}_i$ as $\mathcal{A}_{W_i} = (A_{W_i}, \Sigma, R_{W_i})$, $NORM^{(i)}_i$ as $NORM^{(i)}_{W_i}$, and REP_i as REP_{W_i}, respectively.

We now define the GTESs P_i, $i \geq 1$, over Σ. We define the GTES P_1 as follows.

• For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, and for any $u \in C_\Sigma$, $u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m} \in T_\Sigma$, $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell} \in NORM^{(i)}_0$, if $p = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}]]$, then we put the equation

$$l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]$$

in P_1.

• For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, and for any $u \in C_\Sigma$, $u_1, \ldots, u_{k+\ell} \in T_\Sigma$, $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m} \in NORM^{(i)}_0$, if $p = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+\ell}]]$, then we put the equation

$$l[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m}] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+\ell}]$$

in P_1.

For each $i \geq 1$, we define P_{i+1} from P_i in the following way.

• Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES P_i and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ.

• Let $NORM^{(i)}_0$ be set of the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of the elements of Σ_0. For each $j = 1, \ldots, i$, $NORM^{(i)}_j$ is the smallest set U for which

(i) $NORM^{(i)}_{j-1} \subseteq U$, and

(ii) U contains the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of all terms $f(z_1, \ldots z_m)$, where $f \in \Sigma_m$, $m \geq 1$, $z_1, \ldots, z_m \in NORM^{(i)}_{j-1}$.

• Applying the algorithm of Proposition 5.11, for every $a \in A_i$, we compute a ground term $tree_i(a) \in T_\Sigma$ such that $tree_i(a) \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$. For each $z \in T_{\Sigma \cup A_i}$, we define $tree_i(z)$ by replacing all occurrences of each state $a \in A_i$ with $tree_i(a)$.

• Let $REP_i = \{ tree_i(w) | w \in NORM_i^{(i)} \}$.

(i) We put each equation of P_i into P_{i+1}.

(ii) For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, for any states $a_1, \ldots, a_{k+m}, a \in A_i$, and for any $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell} \in REP_i$, if

$l[a_1, \ldots, a_{k+m}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$,

$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a, and

$(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+m})], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$,

then we put the equation

$l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+m})] \approx r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]$

in P_{i+1}.

(iii) For each equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, for any states $a_1, \ldots, a_{k+\ell}, a \in A_i$, and for any $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m} \in REP_i$, if

$r[a_1, \ldots, a_{k+\ell}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$,

$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a, and

$(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m})], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+\ell})]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$,

then we put the equation

$l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m})] \approx r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+\ell})]$

in P_{i+1}.

Example 7.9 We continue our running example.

$\mathcal{A}_{P_1} = (A_1, \Sigma, R_1)$, where $A_1 = \{ [0]_{\Theta_1}, [1]_{\Theta(P_1)} \}$. R_1 consists of the rules

$0 \rightarrow [0]_{\Theta(P_1)}$, $1 \rightarrow [1]_{\Theta(P_1)}$,

$f([0]_{\Theta(P_1)}, [0]_{\Theta(P_1)}) \rightarrow [0]_{\Theta(P_1)}$, $\quad f([0]_{\Theta(P_1)}, [1]_{\Theta(P_1)}) \rightarrow [1]_{\Theta(P_1)}$,

$f([1]_{\Theta(P_1)}, [0]_{\Theta(P_1)}) \rightarrow [1]_{\Theta(P_1)}$, $\quad f([1]_{\Theta(P_1)}, [1]_{\Theta(P_1)}) \rightarrow [0]_{\Theta(P_1)}$.

Then $\mathcal{A}_{P_1}$ is totally defined. $NORM_0^{(1)} = NORM_1^{(1)} = A_1$, and $REP_1 = \{ 0, 1 \}$.

We get the following result by direct inspection of the definition of GTES P_i, $i \geq 1$.

Statement 7.10 *For each $i \geq 1$, P_i is a finite set of ground instances of the equations in S.*

We can show the following result in the same way as Lemma 7.3.

Lemma 7.11 *For each $i \geq 1$, we can effectively construct the GTES P_i.*

The proof of the following result is similar to that of Statement 7.4.

Statement 7.12 *For all $i \geq 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, i$, $NORM_j^{(i)}$ is the set of the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of all terms of height less than or equal to j.*

Statement 7.13 *For all $i \geq 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, i$, for each $v \in REP_i$, there is a ground term $t \in T_\Sigma$ such that $height(t) \leq i$ and $t \leftrightarrow^*_{\mathcal{A}_i} v$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.11 and by direct inspection of the definitions.

□

Statement 7.14 *For all* $i \geq 1$, *if* $P_i = P_{i+1}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *is totally defined, then* $P_{i+1} = P_{i+2}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Statement 7.5.

□

Statement 7.15 *For all* $i \geq 1$, *if* $P_i = P_{i+1}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *is totally defined, then* $P_i = P_{i+k}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{i+k}$ *for* $k \geq 1$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Statement 7.6.

□

Example 7.16 We continue our running example. Recall that $NORM_1^{(1)} = A_1$. By direct inspection we get that $P_2 = P_1$. By Statement 7.15, $\leftrightarrow^*_{P_k} = \leftrightarrow^*_{P_2}$ for $k \geq 2$.

We can show the following result in the same way as Lemma 7.8.

Lemma 7.17 *For any* $i \geq 1$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, $u \in C_\Sigma$, *and* $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ *if and only if there are states* $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ *such that*

- $u_j \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq m$.
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$, *and*
- $u[a] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(P_i)}$.

When misunderstanding may arise, we denote $\mathcal{A}_i$ as $\mathcal{A}_{P_i} = (A_{P_i}, \Sigma, R_{P_i})$, $NORM_i^{(i)}$ as $NORM_{P_i}^{(i)}$, and REP_i as REP_{P_i}, respectively.

The definition of the GTESs Q_i, $i \geq 1$, over Σ is symmetric to the definition of the GTESs P_i, $i \geq 1$. That is, we obtain the definition of the GTESs Q_i, $i \geq 1$, from the definition of the GTESs P_i, $i \geq 1$, by substituting q for p.

By Statement 7.10 we have the following.

Statement 7.18 *For each* $i \geq 1$, Q_i *is a finite set of ground instances of the equations in* S.

By Statement 7.11 we have the following.

Lemma 7.19 *For each* $i \geq 1$, *we can effectively construct the GTES* Q_i.

By Statement 7.12 we have the following.

Statement 7.20 *For all* $i \geq 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, i$, $NORM_j^{(i)}$ *is the set of the* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *normal forms of all terms of height less than or equal to* j.

By Statement 7.15 we have the following.

Statement 7.21 *For all* $i \geq 1$, *if* $Q_i = Q_{i+1}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_i$ *is totally defined, then* $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{A}_{i+k}$ *for* $k \geq 1$.

By Statement 7.17 we have the following.

Lemma 7.22 *For any $i \geq 1$, $l \in T_\Sigma(X_m)$, $m \geq 0$, $u \in C_\Sigma$, and $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in T_\Sigma$, $q \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_m]]$ if and only if there are states $a_1, \ldots, a_m, a \in A_i$ such that*

- $u_j \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$ *for* $1 \leq j \leq m$.
- $l[a_1, \ldots, a_m] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$, *and*
- $u[a] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} [p]_{\Theta(Q_i)}$.

When misunderstanding may arise, we denote $\mathcal{A}_i$ as $\mathcal{A}_{Q_i} = (A_{Q_i}, \Sigma, R_{Q_i})$, $NORM^{(i)}_i$ as $NORM^{(i)}_{Q_i}$, and REP_i as REP_{Q_i}, respectively.

Statement 7.23 *For each $i \geq 1$, $W_i \subseteq W_{i+1}$, $P_i \subseteq P_{i+1}$, and $Q_i \subseteq Q_{i+1}$.*

Proof. By direct inspection of the definition of the GTESs W_i, P_i, and Q_i, $i \geq 1$.

□

We now present our semi-decision procedure.

Procedure 7.24

```
Input: A TES $S$ over the ranked alphabet $\Sigma$ and ground terms $p, q \in T_\Sigma$.
Output: • 'yes' and the procedure halts if $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$,
• 'no' if the procedure halts and $(p, q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S q$,
• undefined if the procedure does not halt.
$i := 1$;
Compute $W_1$, $P_1$, and $Q_1$;
if $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_1} q$, then begin output 'yes'; halt end;
1: $i := i + 1$;
Compute $W_i$, $P_i$, and $Q_i$;
if $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$, then begin output 'yes'; halt end;
if ($W_i = W_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{W_{i-1}}$ is totally defined) or ($P_i = P_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{P_{i-1}}$ is totally defined) or
($Q_i = Q_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{Q_{i-1}}$ is totally defined), then begin output 'no'; halt end;
goto 1
```

Example 7.25 As for our running example, $(0, f(0,1)) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_1}$. $W_2 = W_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_{W_{i-1}}$ is totally defined. Hence Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'no' in the second step.

Lemma 7.26 *For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} t_n$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n.

Base Case: $n = 1$. Assume that $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1$. there is an equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, and there are $u \in C_\Sigma$, such that

(i) there are $u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell} \in T_\Sigma$ such that

$$p = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}]] \text{ and } t_1 = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]]\,, \tag{13}$$

or

(ii) there are $u_1, \ldots, u_{k+\ell}, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m} \in T_\Sigma$ such that

$$p = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+\ell}]] \text{ and } t_1 = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m}]]\,. \tag{14}$$

First, assume that (i) holds. Let $i = max\{\, height(v_{k+1}), \ldots, height(v_{k+\ell})\,\}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{P_i} = (A_{P_i}, \Sigma, R_{P_i})$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES P_i, and the ground term p over the ranked alphabet Σ.

Let $v_{k+1}\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\downarrow$ denote the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}$, respectively. By Statement 7.12, $v_{k+1}\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\downarrow$ are in $NORM_i^{(i)}$.

By Proposition 5.2

$$p \xrightarrow[R_i]{*} [p]_{\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}} \, . \tag{15}$$

Hence by (23) and Proposition 5.6

$$t_n \xrightarrow[R_i]{*} [p]_{\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}} \, . \tag{16}$$

Then by (13) and (16), $l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \to^*_{R_i} a$ for some state $a \in A_i$, where

$$\text{for each } j = 1, \ldots, k+m, u_j \xrightarrow[R_i]{*} a_j \text{ for some state } a_j \in A_i \, . \tag{17}$$

Moreover, $l[a_1, \ldots, a_{k+m}] \to^*_{R_i} a$, and $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a. By the definition of P_{i+1}, if the equation

$l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, tree(v_{k+1}\downarrow), \ldots, tree(v_{k+\ell}\downarrow)]$

is not in $\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$, then it is in P_{i+1} Hence

$$l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, tree(v_{k+1}\downarrow), \ldots, tree(v_{k+\ell}\downarrow)] \text{ is in } \overset{*}{\underset{P_i}{\leftrightarrow}} \cup P_{i+1} \, . \tag{18}$$

By Proposition 5.11, for each $j = 1, \ldots k+m$, $tree(a_j) \to^*_{R_i} a_j$. Hence by (17) and Proposition 5.4,

$$\text{for each } j = 1, \ldots, k+m, u_j \overset{*}{\underset{P_i}{\leftrightarrow}} tree(a_j) \, . \tag{19}$$

Let $v_{k+1}\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\downarrow$ denote the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}$, respectively. By Statement 7.12, $v_{k+1}\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\downarrow$ are in $NORM_i^{(i)}$. By Proposition 5.4,

$$v_{k+j} \overset{*}{\underset{P_i}{\leftrightarrow}} tree(v_{k+j}\downarrow) \text{ for } 1 \le j \le n \, . \tag{20}$$

By (18), (19), and (20)

$p = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} u[l[tree(u_1), \ldots, tree(u_{k+m})]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}}$
$u[r[tree(u_1), \ldots, tree(u_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]] = t_1$.

Second assume that (ii) holds. This case is similar to the first case.

Induction Step: Let $n \ge 1$, and assume that the satement holds for $1, 2, \ldots, n$. We now show that the satement holds for $n+1$. To this end, assume that there are $t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1} \in T_\Sigma$ such that

$$p \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} t_1 \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} t_2 \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} \cdots \underset{S}{\leftrightarrow} t_{n+1} \, . \tag{21}$$

By the induction hypothesis, there is an integer $j \ge 1$ such that

$$p \overset{*}{\underset{P_j}{\leftrightarrow}} t_1 \overset{*}{\underset{P_j}{\leftrightarrow}} t_2 \overset{*}{\underset{P_j}{\leftrightarrow}} \cdots \overset{*}{\underset{P_j}{\leftrightarrow}} t_n \, . \tag{22}$$

Hence

$$[p]_{\leftrightarrow^*_{P_j}} = [t_n]_{\leftrightarrow^*_{P_j}}\ . \tag{23}$$

By (21), there is an equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, and there are $u \in C_\Sigma$, such that

(i) there are $u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell} \in T_\Sigma$ such that

$$t_n = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}]] \text{ and } t_{n+1} = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]]\,. \tag{24}$$

or

(ii) there are $u_1, \ldots, u_{k+\ell}, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m} \in T_\Sigma$ such that

$$t_n = u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+\ell}]] \text{ and } t_{n+1} = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m}]]\,. \tag{25}$$

First, assume that (i) holds. Let $i = \mathit{max}\{\, j+1, \mathit{height}(v_{k+1}), \ldots, \mathit{height}(v_{k+\ell})\,\}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{P_i} = (A_{P_i}, \Sigma, R_{P_i})$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES P_i, and the ground term p over the ranked alphabet Σ. Let $v_{k+1}\!\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\!\downarrow$ denote the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}$, respectively. By Statement 7.12, $v_{k+1}\!\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\!\downarrow$ are in $\mathit{NORM}_i^{(i)}$. By Proposition 5.2

$$p \xrightarrow[R_i]{*} [p]_{\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}}\ . \tag{26}$$

Hence by (23) and Proposition 5.6

$$t_n \xrightarrow[R_i]{*} [p]_{\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}}\ . \tag{27}$$

Then by (24) and (27), $l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$ for some state $a \in A_i$, where

$$\text{for each } j = 1, \ldots, k+m, u_j \xrightarrow[R_i]{*} a_j \text{ for some state } a_j \in A_i\,. \tag{28}$$

Moreover, $l[a_1, \ldots, a_{k+m}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$, and $\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a. By the definition of P_{i+1}, if the equation

$l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, \mathit{tree}(v_{k+1}\!\downarrow), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(v_{k+\ell}\!\downarrow)]$

is not in $\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$, then it is in P_{i+1}. Thus

$$l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}] \approx r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, \mathit{tree}(v_{k+1}\!\downarrow), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(v_{k+\ell}\!\downarrow)] \text{ is in } \overset{*}{\underset{P_i}{\leftrightarrow}} \cup P_{i+1}\,. \tag{29}$$

By Proposition 5.11, for each $j = 1, \ldots k+m$, $\mathit{tree}(a_j) \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a_j$. Hence by (28) and Proposition 5.4,

$$\text{for each } j = 1, \ldots, k+m, u_j \overset{*}{\underset{P_i}{\leftrightarrow}} \mathit{tree}(a_j)\,. \tag{30}$$

Let $v_{k+1}\!\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\!\downarrow$ denote the $\mathcal{A}_i$ normal forms of $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}$, respectively. By Statement 7.12, $v_{k+1}\!\downarrow, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}\!\downarrow$ are in $\mathit{NORM}_i^{(i)}$. By Proposition 5.4,

$$v_{k+j} \overset{*}{\underset{P_i}{\leftrightarrow}} \mathit{tree}(v_{k+j}\!\downarrow) \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq n\,. \tag{31}$$

By (29), (30), and (31)

$t_n = u[l[u_1, \ldots, u_{k+m}]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} u[l[\mathit{tree}(u_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(u_{k+m})]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}}$
$u[r[\mathit{tree}(u_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(u_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]] \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} u[r[u_1, \ldots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]] = t_{n+1}$.
By (22), $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_n \leftrightarrow^*_{P_{i+1}} t_{n+1}$.

Second assume that (ii) holds. This case is similar to the first case.

□

By Lemma 7.10 and Lemma 7.26 we have the following result.

Lemma 7.27 *For each $i \geq 1$, if $P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, then for each $q' \in T_\Sigma$, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} q'$ if and only if $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q'$.*

By Lemma 7.26 we have the following.

Lemma 7.28 *For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if $q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$,
then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that $q \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} t_n$.*

By Lemma 7.27 we have the following.

Lemma 7.29 *For each $i \geq 1$, if $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, then for each $p' \in T_\Sigma$, $q \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} p'$ if and only if $q \leftrightarrow^*_S p'$.*

Theorem 7.30 *For each $i \geq 1$, $P_i \cup Q_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$.*

Proof. We show that $P_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$. We proceed by induction on i.

Base Case: $i = 1$. Then by the definition of P_1 and W_1, we have $P_1 \subseteq W_1$.

Induction Step: Let $i \geq 1$, and assume that the satement holds for $1, 2, \ldots, i$. We now show that the satement holds for $i + 1$. By the induction hypothesis, $\leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_i = (A_i, \Sigma, R_i)$ be the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES P_i, and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ. Let $l' \approx r'$ be an arbitrary equation in $P_{i+1} - P_i$. Then, by the definition of P_{i+1}, we distinguish two cases.

Case 1: there is an equation $l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, and states $a_1, \ldots, a_{k+m}, a \in A_i$, and ground trees $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell} \in REP_i$ such that
$l[a_1, \ldots, a_{k+m}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$,
$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a, and
$(l[\mathit{tree}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(a_{k+m})], r[\mathit{tree}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$,
and the equation $l' \approx r'$ is of the form

$$l[\mathit{tree}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(a_{k+m})] \approx r[\mathit{tree}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+\ell}] . \qquad (32)$$

Then by Statement 7.13, for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$, there is a $t_{k+j} \in T_\Sigma$ such that $\mathit{height}(t_{k+j}) \leq i$ and $t_{k+j} \leftrightarrow^*_{\mathcal{A}_i} v_{k+j}$. Hence by Proposition 5.4,

$$t_{k+j} \overset{*}{\underset{P_i}{\leftrightarrow}} v_{k+j} \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, m . \qquad (33)$$

By our assumptions and Lemma 7.17, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} u[l[\mathit{tree}_{P_i}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}_{P_i}(a_{k+m})]]$. By the induction hypothesis,

$$p \overset{*}{\underset{W_i}{\leftrightarrow}} u[l[\mathit{tree}_{P_i}(a_1), \ldots, \mathit{tree}_{P_i}(a_{k+m})]] . \qquad (34)$$

Recall that for each $i \geq 1$, $(A_{W_i}, \Sigma, R_{W_i})$ is the congruence class computing tree automaton associated with the GTES W_i, and the ground terms p, q over the ranked alphabet Σ. By Statement 7.4, for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$, there is $v'_{k+j} \in REP_{W_i}$ such that $t_{k+j} \leftrightarrow^*_{\mathcal{A}_{W_i}} v'_{k+j}$. Hence by Proposition 5.4,

$$t_{k+j} \overset{*}{\underset{W_i}{\leftrightarrow}} v'_{k+j} \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, m \ . \tag{35}$$

By the induction hypothesis and (33),

$$t_{k+j} \overset{*}{\underset{W_i}{\leftrightarrow}} v_{k+j} \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, m \ . \tag{36}$$

Hence by (35),

$$v_{k+j} \overset{*}{\underset{W_i}{\leftrightarrow}} v'_{k+j} \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, m \ . \tag{37}$$

By (34) and Lemma 7.8, there are states $b_1, \ldots, b_{k+m}, b \in A_{W_i}$ such that
(a) $tree_{P_i}(a_j) \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} b_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k+m$.
(b) $l[b_1, \ldots, b_{k+m}] \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} b$, and
(c) $u[b] \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} [p]_{\Theta(W_i)}$.
By the definition of W_{i+1}, if the equation
$l[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_{k+m})] \approx r[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_k), v'_{k+1}, \ldots, v'_{k+\ell}]$
is not in $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$, then it is in W_{i+1}. Hence
(d) the equation
$l[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_{k+m})] \approx r[tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_k), v'_{k+1}, \ldots, v'_{k+\ell}]$
is in $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cup W_{i+1}$.
Recall that for the trees $tree_{W_i}(b_1), \ldots, tree_{W_i}(b_{k+m}) \in REP_{W_i}$ we have
(e) $tree_{W_i}(b_j) \rightarrow^*_{R_{W_i}} b_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$.
By (a) and (e) and Proposition 5.3, $tree_{P_i}(a_j) \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} tree_{W_i}(b_j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq k+m$. Hence by (d), (37), and Statement 6.12, the equation (32) is in $\leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i+1}}$. Recall that (32) is an arbitrary equation in $P_{i+1} - P_i$. Hence $P_{i+1} \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i+1}}$.

Case 2: there is an equation
$l \approx r$ of S with $l \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+m})$, $r \in T_\Sigma(X_{k+\ell})$, $k, m, \ell \geq 0$, and states $a_1, \ldots, a_{k+\ell}, a \in A_i$, and ground trees $v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m} \in REP_i$ such that
$r[a_1, \ldots, a_{k+\ell}] \rightarrow^*_{R_i} a$,
$\mathcal{A}_i$ reaches $[p]_\Theta$ starting from a, and
$(l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m})], r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+\ell})]) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$,
and the equation $l' \approx r'$ is of the form
$l[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_k), v_{k+1}, \ldots, v_{k+m})] \approx r[tree(a_1), \ldots, tree(a_{k+\ell})]$.
This case is similar to Case 1.

The proof of the inclusion $Q_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ for $i \geq 1$, is symmetric to the proof of the inclusion $P_i \subseteq \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ for $i \geq 1$.

□

Lemma 7.26, Lemma 7.28, and Theorem 7.30, imply the following result.

Lemma 7.31 *For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, if $p \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$, then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ such that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$.*

For any $n \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in T_\Sigma$, *if* $q \leftrightarrow_S t_1 \leftrightarrow_S t_2 \leftrightarrow_S \cdots \leftrightarrow_S t_n$,
then there is an integer $i \geq 1$ *such that* $q \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_1 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_2 \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} \cdots \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} t_n$.

By Lemma 7.2, Statement 7.31, we get the following.

Lemma 7.32 *Let* $i \geq 1$, *and assume that* $W_i = W_{i+k}$ *for* $k \geq 1$. *Then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$ *if and only if* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

Example 7.33 As for our running example, recall that $W_1 = W_k$ for $k \geq 2$. By Lemma 7.32, $(0, f(0,1)) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$.

By Statement 7.6 and Lemma 7.32 we have the following.

Lemma 7.34 *Assume that* $W_i = W_{i-1}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_{W_{i-1}}$ *is totally defined for some* $i \geq 1$. *Then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i} q$ *if and only if* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

By Statement 7.15 and Lemma 7.27 we have the following.

Lemma 7.35 *Assume that* $P_i = P_{i-1}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_{P_{i-1}}$ *is totally defined for some* $i \geq 1$. *Then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} q$ *if and only if* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

By Lemma 7.35 we have the following.

Lemma 7.36 *Assume that* $Q_i = Q_{i-1}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_{Q_{i-1}}$ *is totally defined for some* $i \geq 1$. *Then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i} q$ *if and only if* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

Theorem 7.37 *If* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$, *then Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'yes'.*

Proof. Assume that $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$. By Lemma 7.26, there is a least integer $k \geq 1$ such that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_k} q$. By Lemma 7.28, there is a least integer $\ell \geq 1$ such that $q \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_\ell} p$. By Lemma 7.31, there is a least integer $j \geq 1$ such that such that $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_j} q$.

First assume that $j = 1$. Then $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_1} q$. Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'yes'.

Second assume that $j \geq 2$. Then by the definition of j, $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j-1$. By Theorem 7.30, $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} \cup \leftrightarrow^*_{Q_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j-1$. Hence by the definition of the integers k and ℓ, $j \leq k$ and $j \leq \ell$. Thus for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, j$, the condition

$P_i = P_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$, and $Q_i = Q_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$,

does not hold. Thus, by Statements 7.15 and 7.21, for $i = 2, \ldots, j-1$, the condition

($P_i = P_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{P_{i-1}}$ is totally defined) or ($Q_i = Q_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{Q_{i-1}}$ is totally defined)

does not hold. Hence Procedure 7.24 does not halt in the first $j-1$ steps. By the definition of the integer j, in the jth step Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'yes'.

□

Theorem 7.38 *If Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'yes', then* $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$. *If Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'no', then* $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$.

Proof. Assume that Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'yes' in the kth step. Then $p \leftrightarrow^*_{W_k} q$. By Statement 7.2, $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$.

Assume that Procedure 7.24 halts and outputs 'no' in the ith step. Then

(a) $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_i}$ and

(b) ($W_i = W_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{W_{i-1}}$ is totally defined) or ($P_i = P_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{P_{i-1}}$ is totally defined) or ($Q_i = Q_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{Q_{i-1}}$ is totally defined).
We now distinguish three cases.

Case 1: $W_i = W_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{W_{i-1}}$ is totally defined. Then by Statement 7.6, $W_i = W_{i+k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence by (a), $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{W_{i+k}}$ for $k \geq 0$. By Lemma 7.32, $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$.

Case 2: $P_i = P_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{P_{i-1}}$ is totally defined. Then by Lemma 7.35, $p \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i} q$ if and only if $p \leftrightarrow^*_S q$. By (a) and Theorem 7.30, $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_{P_i}$. Hence $(p,q) \notin \leftrightarrow^*_S$.

Case 3: $Q_i = Q_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{Q_{i-1}}$ is totally defined. This case is symmetrical to Case 2.

□

Note that we can speed up Procedure 7.24 in the following way. For each $i \geq 1$, at the end of the ith step, we construct the reduced GTRSs W_i', P_i', Q_i' over Σ such that W_i', P_i', Q_i' are equivalent to the GTESs W_i, P_i, Q_i, respectively, see Proposition 4.3. By Proposition 4.6, the number of equations in W_i', P_i', Q_i' is less than or equal to the number of equations in W_i, P_i, Q_i, respectively. Then we let $W_i = W_i'$, $P_i = P_i'$, and $Q_i = Q_i'$. This change does not affect the partial function computed by the procedure.

References

[1] Franz Baader and Tobias Nipkow Term Rewriting and All That, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 1998.

[2] L.Bachmair, N.Dershowitz and D.A.Plaisted, Completion without failure, in H.Ait-Kaci, M.Nivat (eds.), Resolution of Equations in Algebraic Structures, Vol. II: Rewriting Tech- niques, 130, Academic Press, New York, 1989.

[3] M. Bofill, G. Godoy, R. Nieuwenhuis, A. Rubio: Paramodulation and Knuth-Bendix Completion with Nontotal and Nonmonotonic Orderings, Journal of Automated Reasoning, 30 (2003), 99-120.

[4] Z. Fülöp and S. Vágvölgyi, Ground term rewriting rules for the word problem of ground term equations, Bulletin of the EATCS, 45 (1991) 186-201.

[5] Z. Fülöp and S. Vágvölgyi, Restricted Ground Tree Transducers, Restricted ground tree transducers. Theoretical Computer Science 250 (2001) 219-233.

[6] J.-M. Gaillourdet, T. Hillenbrand, B. Löchner, H. Spies: The New WALDMEISTER Loop at Work, in Franz Baader (Ed.): Automated Deduction - CADE-19, 19th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2741 Springer 2003, I 317-321.

[7] F. Gécseg and M. Steinby, *Tree Automata*, Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest, 1984.

[8] Serge Mechveliani, From a Computer Algebra Library to a System with an Equational Prover, in Bruno Buchberger, John A. Campbell (Eds.): Artificial Intelligence and Symbolic Computation, 7th International Conference, AISC 2004, Linz, Austria, September 22-24, 2004, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3249 Springer 2004, 281-284.

[9] Robert Nieuwenhuis, Albert Rubio: Paramodulation-Based Theorem Proving, in: John Alan Robinson, Andrei Voronkov (Eds.): Handbook of Automated Reasoning Volume 1, 371-443, Elsevier and MIT Press 2001.

[10] W. Snyder, A Fast Algorithm for Generating Reduced Ground Rewriting Systems from a set of Ground Equations, Journal of Symbolic Computation, 15 (1993) 415-450.

[11] Terese, Term Rewriting Systems, edited by Marc Bezem, Jan Willem Klop, and Roel de Vrijer, Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 55. Cambridge University Press, 2003, xxii + 884 pp.

[12] S. Vágvölgyi, A fast algorithm for constructing a tree automaton recognizing a congruential tree language, Theoretical Computer Science, 115 (1993) 391-399.

[13] I. Wehrman, A. Stump, E. M. Westbrook: Slothrop: Knuth-Bendix Completion with a Modern Termination Checker, Frank Pfenning (Ed.): Term Rewriting and Applications, 17th International Conference, RTA 2006, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 4098 Springer 2006, 287-296.